



**Faculty of Information and Communication Technology**

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON MULTISPECTRAL IMAGES  
BASED ON FUZZY APPROACH**

**Afirah binti Taufik**

**Master of Science in Information and Communication Technology**

**2020**

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON MULTISPECTRAL IMAGES BASED ON  
FUZZY APPROACH**

**AFIRAH BINTI TAUFIK**

**A thesis submitted  
in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science  
in Information and Communication Technology**

**Faculty of Information and Communication Technology**

**UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA**

**2020**

## **DECLARATION**

I declare that this thesis entitled “Comparative Analysis on Multispectral Images based on Fuzzy Approach” is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

Signature :

Name : Afirah Binti Taufik

Date :

## **APPROVAL**

I hereby declare that I have read this thesis and in my opinion this thesis is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of Master of Science in Information and Communication Technology.

Signature :

Supervisor Name :      Profesor Madya Dr. Sharifah Sakinah Binti  
   Syed Ahmad

Date :

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this work to my family.

My husband

Mohammad Farkhan Mohd Tahrir

My daughter

Aleesya Mohammad Farkhan

My parents

Nilawati Hamzah

Taufik Pandak Hassan

and to all my siblings, family and friends.

I dedicate my love to you all always in this world and the Hereafter.

Thank you Allah.

## ABSTRACT

In particular, the vital information for classification can get lost due to a vast amount of data flow in the classification of remotely-sensed images. Nonetheless, existing techniques used for classifying mixed pixels in remotely-sensed imagery are not too efficient due to the homogenous category. In this study, the information of multispectral data of Landsat 8 is extracted to the three indices are used in this study are to represent of three categories; vegetation, non-vegetation and water body, are normalized difference vegetation indices (NDVI), normalized difference built-up indices (NDBI), and normalized difference water indices (NDWI). The indices are described as the input data for the methods of classification. In the present study, the fuzzy approach methods are developed and tested for a classification land cover mapping. An investigation is conducted based on a comparative study between fuzzy c-means, fuzzy supervised (adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system) and other unsupervised methods, such as k-means. The evaluation of classification approaches on the ability to classify land cover classes with per-pixel digital image classification techniques is based on the user, producer and overall accuracy and kappa coefficient. For imbalance image datasets, the Klang and Krai image are compared to observe the distribution of data affect into user's accuracy (UA) and producer's accuracy (PA). For Klang data, the results show that the method of FCM performs better for UA in the non-vegetation class and PA in the vegetation class, with a percentage of 95.2% and 98.7% respectively. For Krai data, the method of FCM performs better for UA in the vegetation class and PA in the water class with a percentage of 98% and 99% respectively. In future work, more indices and category of classes can be considered to deal with the multispectral data for Landsat 8.

## ABSTRAK

*Dalam proses klasifikasi, maklumat penting mudah tercicir disebabkan oleh banyaknya aliran data dalam pengklasifikasian imej penderiaan jauh. Walau bagaimanapun, teknik sedia ada yang digunakan untuk mengklasifikasikan piksel campuran dalam imejan yang dikesan jauh tidak terlalu cekap kerana merupakan kategori homogen. Dalam kajian ini, maklumat data multispektral Landsat 8 diekstrak ke tiga indeks yang digunakan dalam kajian ini adalah untuk mewakili tiga kategori; tumbuh-tumbuhan, bukan tumbuh-tumbuhan dan badan air, adalah indeks indeks tumbuhan yang berbeza (NDVI), indeks binaan perbezaan (NDBI), dan indeks air perbezaan (NDWI). Indeks digambarkan sebagai data masukan untuk kaedah klasifikasi. Dalam kajian ini, kaedah pendekatan kabur dibangunkan dan diuji untuk pemetaan semping tanah pengelasan. Penyiasatan dilakukan berdasarkan kajian perbandingan antara fuzzy c-means, fuzzy supervised (sistem inferensi neuro-fuzzy adaptif) dan kaedah lain seperti k-means. Penilaian pendekatan klasifikasi mengenai keupayaan untuk mengklasifikasikan kelas perlindungan tanah dengan teknik pengklasifikasian imej digital setiap-pixel didasarkan pada pengguna, pengeluaran dan ketepatan keseluruhan dan pekali kappa. Untuk dataset imej yang tidak seimbang, imej Klang dan Krai dibandingkan dengan memerhatikan pengagihan data mempengaruhi ketepatan pengguna (UA) dan ketepatan pengeluaran (PA). Bagi data Klang, keputusan menunjukkan bahawa kaedah FCM adalah lebih baik untuk UA di kelas bukan tumbuhan dan untuk PA dalam kelas tumbuhan, dengan peratusan masing-masing 95.2% dan 98.7%. Untuk data Krai, kaedah FCM adalah lebih baik untuk UA di kelas tumbuhan dan PA dalam kelas air dengan peratusan 98% dan 99% masing-masing. Pada masa akan datang, lebih banyak indeks dan kategori kelas boleh dipertimbangkan untuk menangani data multispektral untuk Landsat 8.*

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Alhamdulillah, I am thankful to almighty Allah Subhanahuwataala, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful. His infinite mercy has guided me to complete this MSc. work. May peace and blessing of Allah be upon His Prophet Muhammad Sallallahualaihiwassalam. Who has been sent by Him as a mercy and blessing for the entire universe. I express my sincere gratitude to Associate Professor Dr. Sharifah Sakinah Binti Syed Ahmad, my main supervisor for his never ending support and guidance toward the completion of this thesis. Thank you. My gratitude also goes to Associate Professor Gs. Dr. Asmala Bin Ahmad for all the motivation and help. Besides that, I am thankful to my colleagues at the particularly Optimization, Modelling, Analysis, Simulation and Scheduling (OptiMASS) research group for the useful ideas and comments. I am most grateful to the Malaysian Remote Sensing Agency, Department of Agriculture (DOA), Malaysia for providing the data.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | PAGE     |
|--|----------|
| <b>DECLARATION</b>   |          |
| <b>APPROVAL</b>  |          |
| <b>DEDICATION</b>  |          |
| <b>ABSTRACT</b>  | i        |
| <b>ABSTRAK</b>   | ii       |
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>                                      | iii      |
| <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>                                     | iv       |
| <b>LIST OF TABLES</b>  | vii      |
| <b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>                                       | ix       |
| <b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>                                    | xii      |
| <b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>                                 | xiii     |
| <b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>                                  | xv       |
| <br><b>CHAPTER</b>   |          |
| <b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>                                       | <b>1</b> |
| 1.1 Research background                                      | 1        |
| 1.2 Research problems  | 3        |
| 1.3 Research questions                                       | 4        |
| 1.4 Research objectives                                      | 4        |
| 1.5 Research scope   | 6        |
| 1.6 Significance of study                                    | 7        |
| 1.7 Thesis organization                                      | 8        |
| <br><b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</b>                              | <b>9</b> |
| 2.1 Introduction   | 9        |
| 2.2 Remote sensing: Sensor system                            | 9        |
| 2.2.1 Landsat data   | 10       |
| 2.3 Land cover   | 14       |
| 2.4 Indices  | 14       |
| 2.4.1 Normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI)          | 15       |
| 2.4.2 Normalized difference water index (NDWI)               | 16       |
| 2.4.3 Normalized difference built-up index (NDBI)            | 16       |
| 2.5 Features extraction                                      | 17       |
| 2.6 Clasification process                                    | 18       |
| 2.6.1 Supervised classification                              | 18       |
| 2.6.1.1 Fuzzy sets   | 21       |
| 2.6.1.2 Adaptive Neural-based Fuzzy Inference System (ANFIS) | 21       |
| 2.6.2 Unsupervised classification                            | 22       |
| 2.6.2.1 Fuzzy c-means  | 22       |
| 2.6.2.2 Isodata  | 23       |
| 2.6.2.3 K-means  | 24       |
| 2.7 Accuracy assessment                                      | 25       |
| 2.8 Related work on comparison approach                      | 26       |
| 2.9 Summary  | 36       |

|           |   |            |
|-----------|---|------------|
| <b>3.</b> | <b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>   | <b>37</b>  |
| 3.1       | Introduction  | 37         |
| 3.2       | Research design   | 37         |
| 3.3       | Investigation phase   | 42         |
| 3.4       | Research activities   | 44         |
| 3.5       | Software  | 45         |
| 3.6       | Data  | 46         |
| 3.7       | Landsat 8   | 47         |
| 3.8       | Study area  | 49         |
|           | 3.8.1 Klang, Selangor   | 49         |
|           | 3.8.2 Kuala Krai, Kelantan  | 52         |
| 3.9       | Data preparation  | 54         |
|           | 3.9.1 Data pre-processing   | 56         |
|           | 3.9.2 Extraction of study area  | 56         |
| 3.10      | Create ground truth   | 68         |
| 3.11      | Techniques modelling  | 73         |
|           | 3.11.1 Land cover classification using NDVI threshold   | 74         |
|           | 3.11.2 K-means and Isodata classification   | 75         |
|           | 3.11.3 Comparative study for a land cover classification                                      | 77         |
|           | 3.11.4 Classification using FCM and K-means   | 79         |
|           | 3.11.5 ANFIS modelling  | 81         |
| 3.12      | Accuracy assessment   | 86         |
| 3.13      | Summary   | 87         |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>RESULT AND DISCUSSION</b>  | <b>89</b>  |
| 4.1       | Introduction  | 89         |
| 4.2       | K-means and Isodata baseline results  | 89         |
| 4.3       | NDVI threshold classification results   | 92         |
| 4.4       | Classification of Landsat 8 satellite data using FCM and K-means (NDVI and NDWI)              | 98         |
| 4.5       | Classification of Landsat 8 satellite data using FCM, K-means and ANFIS (NDVI, NDWI and NDBI) | 102        |
|           | 4.5.1 ANFIS classification  | 103        |
| 4.6       | Comparison results based on fuzzy supervised, fuzzy unsupervised and K-means                  | 104        |
| 4.7       | Classification of Landsat 8 satellite data using FCM (NDVI and NDWI) for Kuala Krai data      | 108        |
| 4.8       | Statistical analysis  | 110        |
| 4.9       | Discussion  | 120        |
| 4.10      | Summary   | 122        |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>   | <b>123</b> |
| 5.1       | Introduction  | 123        |
| 5.2       | Research summarization  | 123        |
| 5.3       | Conclusion  | 125        |
| 5.4       | Research limitation   | 126        |
| 5.5       | Research contribution   | 126        |
| 5.6       | Suggestion on future work   | 127        |

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| <b>REFERENCES</b> | <b>129</b> |
| <b>APPENDICES</b> | <b>143</b> |

## LIST OF TABLES

| <b>TABLE</b> | <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| 1.1          | Summarization of research problem  | 3           |
| 1.2          | Summary on correlation of research problems, research objectives and research question and anticipated outcome | 5           |
| 2.1          | Launch and decommissioned dates and type of sensor or Landsat series   | 10          |
| 2.2          | Band information for OLI and TIRS  | 11          |
| 2.3          | Value of NDVI  | 15          |
| 2.4          | Analysis gap of methods in classification of land cover  | 29          |
| 2.5          | State-of-art of analysis gap   | 34          |
| 3.1          | Summary of investigation phase   | 43          |
| 3.2          | Summary on correlation of research question, research objectives, task list and expected research contribution | 44          |
| 3.3          | Summarizes the main tools and algorithms   | 45          |
| 3.4          | Bands used from Landsat 8  | 47          |
| 3.5          | Information of data Klang  | 52          |
| 3.6          | Information of data Kuala Krai   | 53          |
| 3.7          | Fuzzy Inference Systems (FIS) for ANFIS classification   | 83          |
| 4.1          | Isodata results (Kuala Krai data)  | 91          |
| 4.2          | K-means results (Kuala Krai data)  | 92          |

|      |  |     |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.3  | NDVI threshold (Klang data)  | 94  |
| 4.4  | NDVI threshold (Kuala Krai data)                                     | 96  |
| 4.5  | FCM classification (NDVI and NDWI) Klang data                        | 100 |
| 4.6  | K-means results (NDVI, NDWI) Klang data                              | 101 |
| 4.7  | Classification Results for FCM, K-means and ANFIS (NDVI, NDWI, NDBI) | 106 |
| 4.8  | FCM classification (NDVI, NDWI) Kuala Krai data                      | 109 |
| 4.9  | Statistical analysis based on FCM for Klang dataset                  | 110 |
| 4.10 | Statistical analysis based on FCM for Kuala Krai dataset             | 110 |
| 4.11 | UA and PA comparative analysis for Klang data                        | 111 |
| 4.12 | UA and PA comparative analysis for Kuala Krai data                   | 116 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE | TITLE   | PAGE |
|--------|---|------|
| 1.1    | Research scope  | 6    |
| 1.2    | Chart for research scope  | 7    |
| 2.1    | Structure of chapter 2  | 9    |
| 2.2    | Features extraction concept                                       | 17   |
| 2.3    | Illustration of basic element for ANN (McCulloch and Pitts, 1943) | 20   |
| 2.4    | Fuzzy logic system (Zadeh, 1965)                                  | 21   |
| 3.1    | Research design of the study                                      | 38   |
| 3.2    | Diagram of data pre-processing                                    | 40   |
| 3.3    | Diagram of preliminary analysis for data preparation              | 41   |
| 3.4    | USGS Earth Explorer   | 48   |
| 3.5    | Location of the study area  | 50   |
| 3.6    | Reference map of Klang  | 51   |
| 3.7    | Location of the study   | 53   |
| 3.8    | Reference map of Kuala Krai                                       | 54   |
| 3.9    | Process to identify the information of remote sensing data        | 55   |
| 3.10   | Load Landsat image in ENVI 5.1                                    | 56   |
| 3.11   | Band selected by RGB image  | 57   |
| 3.12   | Open radiometric calibration                                      | 57   |
| 3.13   | Subsetting image file   | 58   |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 3.14 | Radiometric calibration window  | 59 |
| 3.15 | Nature color using band 4, 3 and 2  | 59 |
| 3.16 | Multibandread functions for visualization   | 61 |
| 3.17 | Grayscale image of (a) NIR, (b) Red, (c) Green  | 62 |
| 3.18 | Landsat bands 4, 3 and 2 assigned to RGB channel (a), bands 5, 4 and 3 assigned to RGB channel (b) and bands 6, 5 and 4 assigned to RGB channel               | 63 |
| 3.19 | Histogram of scatter plot (a) red X-coordinate and NIR Y-coordinate, (b) red X-coordinate and green Y-coordinate, (c) NIR X-coordinate and green Y-coordinate | 66 |
| 3.20 | Pixel features extraction   | 67 |
| 3.21 | Value of NDVI of Klang dataset  | 67 |
| 3.22 | Visualize the Klang image data in RGB color   | 69 |
| 3.23 | Point-pixel using ROI tool  | 70 |
| 3.24 | ROI tool  | 70 |
| 3.25 | SVM classification  | 71 |
| 3.26 | Ground truth created using SVM classification   | 72 |
| 3.27 | Process for Isodata and K-means classification  | 74 |
| 3.28 | Process of NDVI threshold classification  | 77 |
| 3.29 | Comparative study of land cover classification for Klang image  | 78 |
| 3.30 | FCM and K-means classification  | 80 |
| 3.31 | ANFIS modelling development process   | 81 |
| 4.1  | Grayscale image of NDVI   | 93 |
| 4.2  | Color mapping and labelling Klang data  | 95 |
| 4.3  | Color mapping and labelling Kuala Krai data   | 97 |

|      |  |     |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.4  | NDVI and NDWI indices are 2-dimensional data plotted into three clusters | 99  |
| 4.5  | ANFIS model structure  | 104 |
| 4.6  | Completed results for a comparison study                                 | 107 |
| 4.7  | Average of UA and PA for Klang dataset                                   | 113 |
| 4.8  | Non-vegetation class for Klang data                                      | 114 |
| 4.9  | Vegetation class for Klang data  | 114 |
| 4.10 | Water class for Klang data   | 115 |
| 4.11 | Average of UA and PA for Kuala Krai dataset                              | 117 |
| 4.12 | Non-vegetation class for Kuala Krai data                                 | 118 |
| 4.13 | Vegetation class for Kuala Krai data                                     | 118 |
| 4.14 | Water class for Kuala Krai data  | 119 |
| 4.15 | Average of UA and PA for Klang and Kuala Krai datasets                   | 120 |



## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

| <b>APPENDIX</b> | <b>TITLE</b>                    | <b>PAGE</b> |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| A               | Map / Geospatial document price | 143         |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|        |   |                                       |
|--------|---|---------------------------------------|
| AHP    | - | Analytical hierarchy procedure        |
| ANFIS  | - | Adaptive neuro fuzzy inference system |
| ANN    | - | Artificial neural networks            |
| AWEI   | - | Automated water extraction index      |
| BIL    | - | Band interleaved by line              |
| BIP    | - | Band interleaved by pixel             |
| BSQ    | - | Band sequential                       |
| DOA    | - | Department of agriculture             |
| DT     | - | Decision tree                         |
| ENVI   | - | Environment for visualizing images    |
| EROS   | - | Earth resources observation system    |
| ETM    | - | Enhanced thematic mapper              |
| FCM    | - | Fuzzy c-means                         |
| FIS    | - | Fuzzy inference system                |
| GIS    | - | Geographic information system         |
| L1T    | - | Level 1 correction                    |
| LSWI   | - | Land surface water index              |
| LULC   | - | Land use/Land cover                   |
| MATLAB | - | Matrix laboratory                     |
| MIR    | - | Middle infrared                       |

|       |   |  |
|-------|---|--|
| ML    | - | Maximum likelihood                         |
| MNDWI | - | Modified normalized difference water index |
| MSS   | - | Multispectral scanner                      |
| NBR   | - | Normalized burn ratio                      |
| NDBI  | - | Normalized difference built-up index       |
| NDMI  | - | Normalized difference moisture index       |
| NDWI  | - | Normalized difference water index          |
| NIR   | - | Near infrared                              |
| OA    | - | Overall accuracy                           |
| OBIA  | - | Object based image analysis                |
| OLI   | - | Operational land imager                    |
| PA    | - | Producer's accuracy                        |
| PBIA  | - | Pixel based image analysis                 |
| RBV   | - | Return beam vidicon                        |
| RGB   | - | Red-Green-Blue                             |
| ROI   | - | Region-of-interest                         |
| SAVI  | - | Soil-adjusted vegetation index             |
| SWIR  | - | Short-wavelength infrared                  |
| SVM   | - | Support vector machine                     |
| TIRS  | - | Thermal infrared sensor                    |
| TM    | - | Thematic mapper                            |
| UA    | - | User's accuracy                            |
| UTM   | - | Universal transverse mercator              |
| VI    |   | Vegetation index                           |
| WGS   |   | World geodetic system                      |

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Taufik, A., Ahmad, S.S.S. and Azmi, E.F., 2019. Classification of Landsat 8 Satellite Data Using Unsupervised Methods. In *Intelligent and Interactive Computing* pp.275-284.

Taufik, A., Ahmad, S.S.S., and Khairuddin, N.F.E., 2017. Classification of Landsat 8 Satellite Data using Fuzzy c-means. *Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Machine Learning and Soft Computing - ICMLSC '17*, January 2017, pp.58–62.

Taufik, A. and Ahmad, S.S.S., 2016. Land Cover Cassification of Landsat 8 Satellite Data based on Fuzzy Logic Approach. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 37, pp.012062.

Taufik, A., Sakinah, S., Ahmad, S., and Ahmad, A., 2016. Classification of Landsat 8 Satellite Data Using NDVI Thresholds. *Journal of Telecommunication Electronic and Computer Engineering*, 8 (4), pp.37–40.

Taufik, A. and Ahmad, S.S.S., 2015. A Comparative Study Of Fuzzy C-Means And K-Means Clustering Techniques A Comparative Study Of Fuzzy C-Means And K-Means Clustering Techniques. In: *Malaysian Technical Universities Conference on Engineering & Technology*.

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Research background

As far as remote sensing is concerned, the decryption of the data that is sensed remotely is very vital. The foremost priority is to get accurate data of remote sensing imagery of the maps of the land cover as it is used in several applications involving computations like monitoring of environmental resources and earth surface mapping (Cudahy et al., 2016; Mutanga and Kumar, 2019). The images obtained using remote sensing represent a part of the earth's surface as observed from space. The data from remote sensing is obtained by using various electromagnetic sensors like thermal imagery sensors, aerial photography sensors and hyperspectral sensors. The satellite imagery information from sources like Landsat is decoded by using methods such as image processing, remote sensing and mathematical analysis.

Among the most significant applications of satellite imagery at regional and national level is monitoring the change in the cover or use of land, natural disasters, deforestation and gauging the land boundaries. It is very crucial for nations like Malaysia which is rising swiftly and experiencing huge changes in expansion of land and urban areas. If the use of the land is not properly monitored and managed, it may cause tremendous disasters such as floods in built-up regions, landslides, poverty, and loss of tropical forest regions and biodiversity.

Land cover can be described as the built-up region or vegetation that covers the earth's surface (Anderson, 1976; Islam et al., 2018). In remote sensing, land cover is

classified as a particular assignment of pixels in a picture to a specific sort of land cover. The pixels of data assigned then can be utilised to generate land cover's thematic maps. There are two approaches for land cover classification; supervised and unsupervised. Supervised and unsupervised are the two most commonly techniques are used in image classification. Nevertheless, object-based classification (OBIA) has been used recently because it was helpful for high resolution data (Ma et al., 2017).

Maps of the land cover made using remote sensing imagery are used for national and worldwide needs. Malaysia also has put in place the machinery to produce its own maps for showing land cover within its boundaries. It is managed by DOA (Department of Agriculture) since 1966 (Mahmood et al., 1997) and then through an alliance of DOA and MRSA (Malaysian Remote Sensing Agency) which was earlier called MACRES (Malaysian Centre for Remote Sensing), and which is a part of MOSTI (Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation). The MACRES scheme consists of carrying out research on application, assessment of spatial data obtained from remote sensing and modelling in GIS (geographic information system) technology.

In past several years, there has been a rise in the growth of algorithms and techniques used in interpretation and processing of satellite imagery. The fuzzy approach is one such popular technique. Mapping is commonly reached via the application of a conventional statistical classification, which assigns each image pixel to a land cover class. Such techniques are not suitable for mixed pixels that have 2 or more classifications of land cover, and a fuzzy classification technique is necessary. Although pixels might have several and fractional class memberships according to the strength and, if intensely associated with the structure of land cover, mapped to signify such fuzzy land cover (Foody, 1996; Manjula, Pandiarajan and Jagadeesan, 2014; Kalantar et al., 2017). Recent research based on high resolution satellite (Ferrato and Forsythe, 2013; Lv et al., 2019).

This research focuses on methods of classification using the indices from feature extraction for remote sensing images. The interpretation of feature extraction from the spectral, temporal and spatial dimensions is to provide accurate and thematic maps. Thus, the comparison between fuzzy supervised and fuzzy unsupervised are presented for a land cover classification development based on the indices. In this study, the comparative study for imbalanced data based on accuracy assessment is also presented.

## 1.2 Research problems

Due to launches of several satellites having different resolutions, (Denis et al., 2017; Burleigh et al., 2019), there is a vast amount of data of remote sensing imagery that is to be managed. For the same geographical region, high resolution images, satellite image time series, and hyperspectral images are easily available now (U.S. Geological Survey, 2018). The most crucial requirement of the remotely-sensed data is the division of pixels with respect to land cover use and changes. Nonetheless, existing techniques used for classifying mixed pixels in remotely-sensed imagery are not too efficient due to the homogenous category (Choodarathnakara et al., 2012; Dewi et al., 2016; Li et al., 2017). In particular, the information appropriate for the purpose of classification can get lost due to huge amount of data flow in the classification of remotely-sensed images (Lv et al., 2019). The research problems (RP) are summarized as follows in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Summarization of research problem

| No  | Research problems (RP)   |
|-----|--|
| RP1 | The important information for the classification purpose might be hidden by the full set of features in classification of remote sensing images. |
| RP2 | Existing methods defined for mixed and uncertainty pixels are not scale well.  |

### **1.3 Research questions**

Therefore this study attempts to investigate and answer the questions and issues as follows:

1. How features extraction affects into land cover imagery classification?
2. How to perform imaging land cover classification for mixed and uncertainty pixels?
3. How to evaluate the classification using fuzzy approach?

### **1.4 Research objectives**

This study embarks on the following objectives:

1. To generate and construct features extraction from remote sensing images for supervised and unsupervised classification.
2. To construct and compare fuzzy modelling supervised and unsupervised classification.
3. To compare and evaluate several fuzzy approaches.

Table 1.2 shows the summary of problem statements, research objectives and research questions in tabulated form. This table is represented to point out their correlation together with the anticipated outcomes for each problem statement.